1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA JOHNSTOWN DIVISION					
3	INTER CHARGO OF AMERICA					
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,					
5	Plaintiff, Case No: 14-mj-00040					
6	vs. Johnstown, Pennsylvania SEPTEMBER 29, 2014					
7	JOSEPH D. MAURIZIO, JR.,					
8	Defendant.					
9						
10	TRANSCRIPT OF DETENTION PROCEEDINGS  BEFORE KEITH A. PESTO					
11	DISTRICT MAGISTRATE JUDGE					
12						
13	A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S					
14	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: Stephanie L. Haines, AUSA United States Attorney's Office Penn Traffic Building, Ste. 200					
15	319 Washington Street Johnstown, PA 15901					
16	FOR THE DEFENDANT: Steven P. Passarello, Esq.					
17	Passarello & Sisto 616 Hileman Street					
18	Altoona, PA 16601					
19	COURT REPORTER: Kimberly K. Spangler, RPR United States District Court					
20	Penn Traffic Building, Ste. 204 319 Washington Street					
21	Johnstown, PA 15901					
22	(814) 536-9999					
23	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,					
24	transcript produced with computer.					
25						

1	<u>I N D E X</u>					
2	September 29, 2014					
3	Defendant's					
4	Witness:	Direct	Cross	Redirect		
5	VINCENT E. VENA	36	39			
6	JOHANNA VENA	40	42			
7	ANGELA L. MAURIZIO	43				
8						
9	Certificate of reporter	64				
10	certificate of reporter	0 4				
11		* * *				
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

```
1
                         PROCEEDINGS
 2
        (The proceedings convened on September 29, 2014,
 3
       commencing at 10:07 a.m.)
 4
               MR. PASSARELLO: Your Honor, may we approach,
 5
       briefly?
 6
               THE COURT: Do you want this on the record or
 7
       off?
 8
               MS. HAINES: On.
 9
               (Discussion held at sidebar.)
10
               MR. PASSARELLO: I have Father Thomas Hopko with
11
       me. He is the canon lawyer through the diocese for
12
       Father Maurizio. I would ask that he be allowed to sit
13
       at the table with me --
14
               THE COURT: That's fine. He's co-counsel as far
15
       as that's concerned. Yeah.
16
               Apparently, because of the identity of the
17
       parties the courtroom is packed, and there was a request
18
       from the CSOs that they use the jury box to put
19
       spectators in, and I said no to that because the bar is
20
       the bar.
21
               If he's an admitted attorney he's on this side of
22
       the bar.
23
               MR. PASSARELLO: Well, he's a lawyer --
24
               THE COURT: If he's a canon lawyer -- you would
25
       bring your paralegal, you would bring your secretary,
```

```
1
       they're a part of your defense team, that's fine.
 2
               MR. PASSARELLO: Thank you.
 3
               MS. HAINES: I am not opposed -- I know usually
 4
       they have the row right behind me closed because of
 5
       previous incidents. If they want to put, just for ease
 6
       of people standing, if they want to put the media back
 7
       there I don't care. If you authorize that. If the
 8
       marshals are okay with that, I don't care if they open
 9
       that first row right behind me for media.
10
               THE COURT: Oh. You mean the separate chairs on
       this side of the bar?
11
12
               MS. HAINES: No, no, no. Behind the bar.
13
       first row behind the prosecution is usually roped off --
14
               THE COURT: Oh. Well, I'm not going to interfere
15
       with the marshals. It's their call, whatever they want
16
       to do is fine.
17
               MS. PRICE:
                          They just asked me what you want to
18
       do, that's why --
19
               THE COURT: I don't anticipate any disruption, so
20
       if they want to use those for seats that's fine.
21
               Anything else?
22
               MR. PASSARELLO: No, Your Honor.
23
               MS. HAINES: In talking with Mr. Passarello, the
24
       intent is for the government to proceed by proffer as we
25
       have in the past.
```

THE COURT: Okay. I'll ask that on the record. 1 2 MS. HAINES: Okay. 3 MR. PASSARELLO: Thank you, Your Honor. (The following proceedings were held in open 4 5 court:) 6 THE COURT: Let's go on the record. It's shortly 7 after 10 o'clock on Monday, September 29th, 2014. We're 8 in Courtroom A for a detention hearing in the United 9 States v. Joseph D. Maurizio, Jr. My number 14-40-mj. 10 The government is present represented by Attorney 11 Haines, and the defendant is present represented by 12 Attorney Passarello. 13 There was a little bit of discussion before we 14 went on the record about seating. This is probably the 15 most crowded courtroom I've had in 20 years. Folks, we 16 do this every week. The lurid nature of the publicity 17 involved has packed the courtroom, but this is an 18 ordinary proceeding we do all the time. The courtroom 19 is always open; you're welcome to come any time. But 20 because of the nature of the proceeding it's attracted a 21 little more than the usual attention. That does not 22 mean that I do not expect decorum to be maintained. 23 With that said, back to the government. Now, 24 normally in a detention hearing the government either 25 proceeds by proffer from the pretrial services report or

1 presents evidence. Which do you please to do today? 2 MS. HAINES: We intend to proceed by proffer, 3 Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Very well. 5 Do you have any witnesses, Attorney Passarello? 6 MR. PASSARELLO: I do, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to hold them in 8 reserve until you've heard what the government has to 9 say, or do you want them sworn now? 10 MR. PASSARELLO: I apologize, Your Honor. I 11 would hold them in reserve until I hear the proffer. 12 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. All right, 13 government. 14 MS. HAINES: Well, Your Honor, we are proceeding 15 in this case under a presumption of detention case based 16 upon the first charge in the complaint, which is the 18 17 United States Code, Section 2423(c) offense. And being 18 that it's a presumption case, we are invoking that 19 presumption, which pushes the burden to the defense to 20 establish terms and conditions or reasons why or how 21 they can rebut that presumption. That is how the 22 government intends to proceed. 23 THE COURT: All right. So you have nothing 24 beyond the original complaint and the pretrial services 25 report which gives the defendant's history, ties to the

community, and other personal circumstances.

MS. HAINES: Your Honor, I do have an additional proffer. I wasn't sure if you want me to make my proffer right now --

THE COURT: Yeah. Go ahead.

MS. HAINES: Sure.

Your Honor, the United States concurs wholeheartedly with the pretrial services report which does recommend detention of Father Maurizio in this case. They base their detention finding on both a risk of flight as well as a danger to the community, and the government concurs and wholly supports those findings.

We would bring to the Court's attention, in addition to the fact that it is, like I stated, a presumption of detention case, the following for you to consider: We'll do the risk of flight first. We believe that Father Maurizio is a risk of flight. As the pretrial services report pretty well those Father Maurizio has engaged in extensive travel outside of the confines of the United States. Just looking in his last year of travel, he has been in and out of the States I believe seven or eight times to third-world or Central American countries.

With that being said, obviously he has established contacts in those locations. We are not

sure of all of those contacts or his loyalty or their loyalty to him outside of the confines of the United States. We believe, though, those circumstances definitely pose a risk of flight.

We also look at the fact that while we have secured.

His passport, I have talked with our Homeland Security agents, and while they have asked to be basically informed of any attempt by Father Maurizio to obtain another passport, they have also talked with me about the fact that reality is if someone does try to attempt to get another passport, sometimes the reality of it is they get that passport and are either out of the country through Canada and elsewhere before the agents even get that information. With that being said, we believe that's yet another factor of a risk of flight.

We also, through our investigation, are aware of or have heard about large sums of money in the past that the defendant has had in his possession. We are still tracking those allegations and those circumstances down. But yet that's another concern of ours, that these sums of money we've heard about we're not sure where they came from, who they came from, where they may be or if they currently exist in those amounts, which we believe

is yet another concern of him leaving.

The crux and the main points that we'd like to make, though, for why the defendant should remain detained go to the danger to the community, Your Honor.

When you look at the allegations themselves that are contained within the criminal complaint there are the two charges: Basically, the sex tourism charge, which the presumption kicks in on, which involves allegations that Father Maurizio engaged with Honduran minor males on multiple occasions while he was visiting and supposedly on mission-related work.

As the criminal complaint shows, the Homeland Security agents actually were in Honduras, boots on the ground, talking to some of these victims. They are still in pursuit of finding other victims. Because, of course, as they talk to some they are given more information about others that exist out there.

As the Court is aware, Honduras is a very poor country. The living conditions of these victims are horrific. These agents are finding them and talking with them. The ones we've talked to so far -- it's outlined in the complaint -- they have come forward after we have found them. Have looked for and found them. It's not like they're knocking down the government's door in some alleged conspiracy against

Father Maurizio. The agents have found them and talked to these victims. They have explained in detail what Father Maurizio did to them, and they're outlined in the complaint.

They talk about how he would pay in candy to have sexual acts performed in front of him, by him, and for him. They talk about how he took pictures of these children while they were naked. It talks about how he took pictures of them while they were showering, and he propositioned them with money for additional pictures, for their silence.

The victims talk about how they were asked by

Father Maurizio -- and these were minor boys -- that

they were asked by him to masturbate themselves while he

watched. They talked about how they were photographed

by the defendant while they were masturbating at his

direction. They told us about how he talked to one

child and asked the child how much he would charge for

the child to masturbate in front of him. When the child

refused to do that, the child victim tells us that the

father paid him for his silence, about what he had just

done and what he had just asked for.

We also have a victim who talks about how the father placed his hand on his genitals. We also have a -- the boy who talks about after the minor boy's penis

was touched by the father, how the father immediately gave him money for that act. And we also have, most horrifically, a victim who talks about how in the chapel the father performed oral sex on a 14-year-old boy.

All this during a time he was in Honduras on a mission to basically help children, he used and abused them.

That is just a small summary of the evidence that goes on the sex tourism, which is the rebuttal for the presumption.

We also then have the second count in the indictment which deals with the possession of child pornography. And that is as a result of about, about almost two and a half weeks ago on September 12th Homeland Security officers and agents executed search warrants at the home farm of the defendant, as well as the rectory at the parish where the father performed services.

As a result of our obtaining literally thousands of pieces of evidence, we have yet to scratch the surface but we have already uncovered images of child pornography.

And I want to point out for purposes of just where the investigation still has yet to go, because it's a fluid and ongoing investigation. Obviously,

we're at the complaint stage, but this is rapidly evolving into many other areas and many other possible charges. Speaking just to the images that are charged in the complaint for the possession of child pornography, they are graphic images of a prepubescent minor, who it appears he has been posed, fully naked, genitalia exposed, up on the side of a filthy bed with a leg, it appears to be posed in such a way to highlight the lascivious exhibition of his genitalia.

The investigation has shown that this child had polio, which leads us to believe he had to be posed in that manner, that he possibly wasn't capable of doing it on his own. As the investigation develops what we believe, and what we intend to continue to pursue, is that Father Maurizio took those pictures.

As the Court is aware, production or manufacture of child pornography is a mandatory minimum of 15 years on every single picture that was taken.

In addition to those pictures of the child that were seized and in our possession that deals with Count 2, the charges in the complaint, we also have various other pictures of what we are terming "child erotica." I can't give you a number, but there are several series of pictures where there are fully naked children, either one in particular the same child, seven

or eight pictures of this fully naked toddler from all various directions that the camera took pictures of him. We have other pictures of children frolicking in water completely naked. The interesting thing --

THE COURT: Hang on a second. Let me stop you there, because my parents would be in jail under that, because everybody's got pictures of kids in kiddie pools.

Now stop -- let's go back, though, to the child with polio who's posed. I want to hear about that.

Tell me what you've got in the way of evidence that shows that this is related to the sex tourism case. Is this child that's posed a person that would have been associated with the humanitarian mission that the defendant is associated with?

MS. HAINES: This child where he is located, where he lives, he lives at the bottom of the hill. He lives with his mother at the bottom of the hill, where if you go up the hill is where the missionary HIM and Father Maurizio would go. So he is right down the hill. And he had contact with this child and the mother during his trips to Honduras.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're inferring that this is a manufactured picture, not just a -- because, you know, once again, we do this every week. If this were a

```
1
       person who's just downloading stuff off the internet you
 2
       probably wouldn't even be moving for detention.
 3
               MS. HAINES: Well, Your Honor, correct. What the
 4
       importance of this is is the investigation to date has
 5
       been able to identify who the child is, the location
 6
       that the picture was taken -- which, like I said, is
 7
       right down the hill from the Honduran nonprofit where
 8
       the defendant was, and has been able to identify through
 9
       contact back and forth between Honduran authorities who
10
       this child is and where he lives, and the picture was
11
       taken at a time when Father Maurizio was in Honduras.
12
               THE COURT: All right. That clarifies things.
13
               The images, though, that you're referring to, is
       it what you set forth in Paragraph 16 of the complaint?
14
15
               MS. HAINES: Before I answer let me make sure I
16
       look at Paragraph 16.
17
               THE COURT: You're giving me more detail about
18
       the same incident that you mentioned in Paragraph 16 of
19
       the complaint.
20
               MS. HAINES: Yes, Your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: Okay.
22
               MS. HAINES: Yes, Your Honor, and --
23
               THE COURT: So to follow up though, that was
24
       2009.
25
               MS. HAINES: Correct.
```

THE COURT: And those allegations, according to your allegations to me, were in the hands of the FBI and -- the complaints were made in 2009, so this complaint has been out there since 2009.

MS. HAINES: The complaint dealing with allegations of Father Maurizio touching and inappropriate sexual contact with children, yes, dates back to 2009.

THE COURT: So this is something new.

MS. HAINES: The pictures we are talking about are pictures we saw for the first time when seized back on September 12th -- just two, two and a half weeks ago -- when we seized his computer and we took hard drives and a camera and over 280 CDs. These were things that the child pornography charge that is in the complaint, Count Number 2, that is derived from evidence we seized on September 12th, just two weeks ago.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. HAINES: The pictures on the computer. The other pictures I'm talking about too, you said, "oh, your parents could be in trouble for that" --

THE COURT: Actually, what I'm actually quoting is Kelly Preston from the movie *Sky High* where she -- it's the kid's first day of high school, and how can you embarrass a kid more than talk about them frolicking in

1 the kiddie pool, so. 2 MS. HAINES: But --3 THE COURT: In any case, back to this. We're 4 talking about a 2009 image, correct? 5 MS. HAINES: Right. Through our investigation, 6 the reason we're able to pretty much pinpoint when this 7 picture was taken, this child is now deceased. And we 8 were able to find out when he died and date back and work back to -- and looking at him as well you can tell 9 10 an age on him. 11 THE COURT: All right. But my charge, as you 12 know, is not quilt or innocence. My charge is danger to 13 the community. So do you have anything more recent than 14 2009? 15 MS. HAINES: Yes. Yes. And, Your Honor, I'm 16 getting there. And the reason I laid the foundation, 17 since this is a complaint detention hearing you are 18 allowed -- because it hasn't gone in front of the grand 19 jury yet you are allowed to hear, as the grand jury 20 would, the facts and circumstances underlying this when 21 you're determining detention. 22 THE COURT: Right. 23 MS. HAINES: So I think it's important for you to 24 take what happened in 2009, as I bring you forward, as 25 you consider detention on a complaint rather than

1 an affidavit. 2 THE COURT: Right. 3 MS. HAINES: Excuse me, rather than an 4 indictment. 5 THE COURT: Right. 6 MS. HAINES: So we've got all that going on in 7 2009. 8 THE COURT: Right. 9 MS. HAINES: Bringing things more forward, like I 10 said, we executed a search warrant on September 12th. 11 We find the images of child pornography. We also, like 12 I said, we've just scratched the surface in looking at 13 everything so far that we have seized. But just to give you a flavor of the more recent stuff we found on either 14 15 a laptop and/or a loose hard drive that came out of the 16 office rectory more relevant to today and detention, on 17 Father Maurizio's, one of his media items that we seized 18 we have him accessing websites, I believe in July. We 19 have him accessing websites such as www:justusboys.com. 20 Now, when we did a quick preview of that website 21 it appears, when you open the website, to be various 22 videos and/or pictures and images of adult homosexual acts. On the left-hand side there are different 23 24 categories on justusboys.com. One of them is younger. 25 We went to that. We have not done a complete preview of

all that, but it caught our attention. We also have him -- there's an article that was downloaded on his computer called -- it referred to Costa Rica sex tourism. We know he travels back and forth to Costa Rica. That concerned us.

We also had on his computer which was downloaded a 16-year-old Mr. Philippine swimsuit pageant long video. That while the 16 year olds from what we saw were clothed, they were scantily clothed in very small bathing suits, and it seemed to focus in or be very -- emphasizing the areas of this Mr. Philippines 16 year old video.

Also very compelling, as the Court may be aware, as a result of obtaining the complaint and the arrest warrant last week, there was information put out to the public regarding, you know, any tips or further information, which is standard in these types of cases because it is an ongoing investigation. And without putting any great detail out, we have received tips of potential local victims at the hands of Father Maurizio. Those things are being tracked down immediately by law enforcement.

But I think it's important for this Court to understand when we're talking about danger to the community, we do have people coming forward naming

1 specific names of minor boys in this district that may 2 be victims. We have yet to even interview them because 3 of how quickly this is all happening. 4 Releasing Father Maurizio out into the public 5 when we are still getting our hands around these 6 possible victims and bringing them in and talking with 7 them would be a complete -- a possibility of 8 obstruction, but it would be very detrimental. 9 THE COURT: Okay. But you're piling supposition 10 on supposition. We have an accusation that we haven't 11 even investigated yet, and if you let him out he's going 12 to go interfere with an investigation of something we 13 haven't even investigated yet. 14 MS. HAINES: But there's a presumption of 15 detention, Your Honor, and I'm telling you what's out 16 there --17 THE COURT: Yeah. But I'm not required to just 18 say, you know, the government wants it, I've got to give 19 it to them. I mean, there --20 MS. HAINES: No, but --21 THE COURT: There has to be some evidence. What 22 you've got is an accusation. 23 MS. HAINES: What we have is an accusation, 24 correct, Your Honor, that came in from --25 THE COURT: You have an accusation that you

1 haven't checked out yet. 2 MS. HAINES: We have not, Your Honor. They are 3 being interviewed. The accusation just came in this 4 weekend. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MS. HAINES: It's from a credible source in our 7 investigation, because we know the person who gave us 8 the information and they identified the potential 9 victims. So that is going forward as of today. 10 THE COURT: Is there a date on the alleged 11 occurrence? 12 MS. HAINES: If I could ask the --13 THE COURT: Sure. 14 MS. HAINES: -- agents? 15 (An off-the-record discussion was held.) 16 MS. HAINES: The agents informed me that there 17 was no specific date given, but that it's recent 18 behavior by the children that caused the concern, and 19 that these are minor boys that have had a lot of access 20 to the father, both supervised and unsupervised. And 21 that while there's not a date given, these are 22 definitely minors and this has occurred recently. 23 THE COURT: Okay. So it would be fair to say 24 after this story broke some parent said to their kid, 25 did anything like this ever happen to you, and he said,

```
1
       well, yeah, mom, as a matter of fact. And that's how it
 2
       all started; is that what you're putting out there?
 3
               MS. HAINES: I don't believe that's the exact
       scenario. As the tip came in, it is a relative of the
 4
 5
       children that is responding and relaying, I think you
 6
       want to interview those of us that are around the
 7
       children as well as these children, because this is what
 8
       we have witnessed by these children who have been around
 9
       him on quite a frequent basis.
10
               THE COURT: And that behavior is taking place
11
       within the last year?
12
               (An off-the-record discussion was held.)
13
               MS. HAINES: What the agent tells me is these
14
       children that have been possibly alleged as victims, we
15
       have seen extensive photography by the father of these
16
       children on his cell phone within the last year.
17
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. That at least
18
       gives me some date. Can you give me a rough age for
19
       these kids?
20
               MS. HAINES: Seven and five.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. I know I'm
22
       interrupting the flow of your presentation --
23
               MS. HAINES: That's okay.
24
               THE COURT: -- so if you want to take your notes
25
       and get back on track go ahead.
```

MS. HAINES: I'm sort of in the part where we're trying to educate the Court just on some of the recent events that have happened, as this obviously has just evolved. We've got the stuff in the past. You see from the pretrial services report he has had various recent travels.

I can say another thing that's quite recent that we have in our possession is the father on July 30th of 2014, and August 1st of '14, we seized during a border search his cell phone when he was coming back into the country from when he was visiting Costa Rica and Nicaragua on one of his mission trips. And during a border search we were able to seize his cell phone. And during that border search what the investigators used was a Google application that does translation between two parties that are having a conversation in different languages.

As a result of the seizure of his phone there at the end of July, beginning of August, we seized and used the Google app to translate a conversation that went on between Father Maurizio and what we believe to be one, if not two -- because there's two different boys' names that are said during the conversation -- that are minors. And just sort of as an idea of some of this conversation that was translated and that HSI agents

have, there is questioning going back and forth from the father to these minor boy or boys about, Do you have a girlfriend, Do you have sex with your girlfriend. He also asks if the minor boy would like to come to the United States with him. He also asks if the minor child is going to miss him, and hopefully he'll see him again when he comes back in March of 2015. And says basically, Are you going to miss me, I won't be back until March of 2015 because I have -- and he lists all the other countries that he intends to go and visit prior to him returning to this country.

So the concern, of course, was the conversation between the father and the minor child. Once again taking it into -- not segregating one little piece of evidence but taking it into the totality of what we have, you know, that translation between a minor child and the defendant, with finding child pornography on his rectory computer, along with other victims potentially coming forward with things we still have to look at, and still having to look at thousands and thousands of pieces of images yet to date with the presumption, the risk of flight we've already articulated and what we believe is a true danger to the community with his release, we are asking that he be detained.

THE COURT: Okay. How do you know that the --

1 this is a text exchange? This is an exchange by text 2 that you seized from the cell phone? 3 (An off-the-record discussion was held.) 4 MS. HAINES: The agent --5 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Overhearing 6 what -- you had a conversation with the agent. This is 7 an oral conversation? 8 MS. HAINES: Or texting into the phone. 9 not sure if it's orally being said into the phone and 10 then being translated by the app, or being texted into 11 the phone and then being translated by the app. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I was wondering how you 13 can determine that -- it's unusual for a person to text 14 or to say, Hello, John, age 14. You usually say, Hello, 15 John or text, Hello, John. 16 How do you know the person's a minor? 17 MS. HAINES: Because there's two different names 18 that are specifically mentioned in the text. And the 19 discussion revolved around that the boy is currently 16 20 years old, and that when he comes back -- when Maurizio 21 comes back in March of 2015 the child may be 18 by then. 22 And I apologize, I should have said that --23 THE COURT: No, no. That's okay. 24 MS. HAINES: That's the translation. 25 THE COURT: And then one thing that I'm just kind

1 of curious about: If I'm traveling internationally the 2 government can seize my cell phone? 3 MS. HAINES: Border detention. Border, yes, when 4 you come back --5 THE COURT: Without any --6 MS. HAINES: It's called a border search. 7 THE COURT: Oh, so they just do that routinely on 8 the basis of a profile or --9 MS. HAINES: It can be a random border search. 10 It can be sort of your number's up and your stuff gets 11 searched, or there can be some type of reasonable 12 suspicion that may lay reason why those bags are looked 13 at for a border search. 14 But the analysis on the personal cell phone of 15 the defendant was done, pursuant to a border search when 16 he came back into the country, and I believe the port 17 was Miami -- it was Atlanta. When he came back into the 18 country through Atlanta a border search was conducted at 19 that point by HSI agents. 20 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm not 21 quarrelling with the Fourth Amendment law. I just find 22 it ironic that on the one hand, back when you were 23 talking about risk of flight you said, We can't be sure 24 that he's not going to get a passport and fly away 25 without us knowing about it. And on the other hand you

1 just kind of routinely seize people's cell phones when 2 they come into the country from a trip to Paris or 3 whatever. 4 MS. HAINES: Well, that's predicated on them 5 coming back though. In that situation, coming back into 6 Atlanta they got it. We're talking about someone is 7 able to secure a passport after we've seized it, I doubt 8 they'd be coming back to us. That's our fear, the 9 defendant, that if he finds another way to obtain 10 another passport or make contacts in another country or 11 obtain money, that we wouldn't have that luxury of 12 coming back. THE COURT: Oh, I understand. I understand what 13 14 you're afraid of. I think -- I just think it's ironic 15 about why you say you fear that. All right. Okay. I 16 think I understand the government's case. 17 MS. HAINES: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Thanks. 19 Attorney Passarello. 20 MR. PASSARELLO: Morning, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Good morning. 22 MR. PASSARELLO: Your Honor, I think what's 23 important to start with is what is before this Court 24 today based upon the law in question. Obviously, there 25 is a presumption. However, the Court's focus is

twofold: One, is the defendant a flight risk. And the Commonwealth -- the United States -- must prove that by a preponderance. Sorry for that slip.

THE COURT: It's okay. I know you practice law in Blair County where Pennsylvania is the Commonwealth, and here in federal court the prosecutor is the government.

MR. PASSARELLO: Yes.

And the second, Judge, is that the defendant presents a danger to the community, and that's by clear and convincing evidence.

Let's just talk about the first one first. Look

I believe that if they've seized his passport, they've

taken his passport. And if the Court puts a condition

that he has to be on home detention, the fear of flight

is minimal here. It amazes me that the United States

can come in here and say, Well, even though we got this

flagged and we believe that he does all this kind of

stuff to these children in all these different

countries, somehow some way he may still be able to get

a passport and may still be able to get through customs

and may still be able to get to a different country.

It amazes me that they say that, especially if they're going to flag him. I don't think there's any risk of flight here at all.

1 THE COURT: Well, just to stop you there. 2 the statute I'm operating under, in any case that 3 involves these allegations, any release shall contain at a minimum a condition of electronic monitoring, plus 4 5 restrictions on personal associations, places of abode, 6 travel, reporting on a regular basis, and curfew. 7 MR. PASSARELLO: Absolutely. 8 THE COURT: But at the very least, if he gets out 9 he gets out with an ankle bracelet and under home 10 confinement so --11 MR. PASSARELLO: Correct. 12 THE COURT: -- that's what you're saying. 13 MR. PASSARELLO: That is exactly what I'm saying, 14 Judge. And they've taken his passport. I don't see how 15 he can even get out of the country. The second, Judge, 16 is --17 THE COURT: Well, actually, we had a case about a 18 year ago I think a person who had been released, and the 19 week before he was scheduled to enter his plea he just 20 got on a plane and went to Australia or someplace. We 21 don't have an extradition treaty, and it was kind of an 22 "egg on our face" situation, so it does happen. 23 MR. PASSARELLO: Okay. In this case, Your Honor, 24 I believe, based upon the taking of the passport, the 25 conditions that would be placed on this defendant, I

don't think the Commonwealth meets that burden that he poses a flight risk.

The second, obviously, is the defendant presents a danger to the community. And I understand, Judge, there's a presumption. It is a rebuttable presumption, and it is not a burden of proof on me, it's been characterized as a burden of production.

If the Court takes a look at what the Commonwealth has presented, what they have presented is, We believe we may be able to show this; we believe that there may be other victims that are coming out; we believe we -- none of those have been charged.

What we're charged with here is, according to the affidavit, one picture of an individual boy back in 2009 who now they inform me has been deceased. And if the Court -- I believe under the statute one picture actually is an affirmative defense for the --

THE COURT: Actually, Paragraph 16 says images, plural. But Attorney Haines was just referring to one particular picture. So they say they have images, quote.

MR. PASSARELLO: They say they have images, and she characterized them as child erotica not child pornography. The only image that has been told before this Court of child pornography that they allege is the

image of this one boy. And I believe it's only one
image, although she may have said two. I apologize,
two. But under the statute I still think that may be an
affirmative defense. I think it's three or less.

Secondly, Your Honor, if Father Maurizio's released on home detention there is -- I don't believe he poses a danger to the community. I have a bunch of witnesses here, including family members as well as parishioners, that will tell you wonderful things about Father Maurizio, and I'm sure maybe the Court doesn't want to hear them.

But if the Court takes a look at the pre-detention investigation you'll see a number of things. One is ties to the community --

THE COURT: He's living on the property that he was born on that belonged to his parents, right?

MR. PASSARELLO: He has lived pretty much here all of his life. He's been a priest for approximately 27 years. He's done missionary work, and wonderful missionary work. They portray him as a monster. I portray him as a wonderful -- he does wonderful missionary work for 17 years, has helped a ton of underprivileged individuals.

Judge, he has, obviously, no prior criminal record, has never been a flight risk before. And I will

inform the Court of this: These allegations reared their heads back in 2009. We hired a defense team down in Honduras to investigate those allegations. They went no where. They were with the FBI until Laurel Highlands, and no charges have been filed. These in essence, to me, are a regurgitation of those charges.

And I don't know the boys they've interviewed because they only list them as John Doe One, John Doe Two, and John Doe Three. However, we have interviewed boys from the Honduras, and I have declarations from those boys that will inform you that Father Joe did nothing of the kind, and that they were offered money, toys, and candy in order to say things about Father Joe that they deemed to be untrue. That's the climate that we are in in this case.

Now, the danger to the community, look, as soon as you put this out in the newspaper or the tip line people are going to -- I mean, people are going to say, Jimmy was abused, Johnny was abused. There has never been any indication until these charges were filed of any child that was in the parish of Father Maurizio, was an alter boy for Father Maurizio, or any type of relation to Father Maurizio had ever made an allegation against him at all in the United States. None. None at all.

He has strong family support. He has strong community ties. He has no prior record. He has done -- he served in the military. He served in the United States Navy, was honorably discharged.

I believe, Your Honor, that you have to look at what's before you today. Not supposition, not speculation, not any of that, in order to make your determination.

Now, look, if they come up with more stuff down the road there's always the opportunity to come back.

But for purposes of today, even though the presumption exists, I believe we've rebutted it with the evidence in the presentence and my argument here today.

And I would also like to present at least some witnesses who have done missionary work with Father Joe, that have had their children around Father Joe that will tell this Court there is no concern and there's never been any.

THE COURT: Sure. If you have witnesses I'll hear them.

We say presumption and rebut. But two things:
You can't beat something with nothing. You actually
have to propose a release plan. What's the proposed
release plan?

MR. PASSARELLO: My proposed release plan, Your

Honor, is that he be released, that he obviously remain on all the conditions of home detention, that he have an ankle bracelet, that he have a curfew, that he not be allowed around children -- not because we're admitting any of these allegations, basically for his own protection -- that he report subject to any random checks. All that. Anything that the Court wants to put on him that the Court would assure -- and I think that does assure that there's no danger to this community.

I think the people that sit here speak volumes for what type of person Father Maurizio is. The type of person that Attorney Haines presented to this Court is not the Father Maurizio I've known for five years. And I'm sure it's not the Father Maurizio these people have known all of their lives. And I think there's a balancing act.

And I believe, number one, I don't think they've proven flight risk. I think it's pretty simple to get rid of that risk of flight.

Secondly, I think with strict conditions on his release; bracelet, home detention, random checks, reporting every day if the Court wants him to report, and not being around children, not even having computers, cell phones, or any type of media, if the Court wants to put that in. Obviously, I think he

should be allowed to watch TV. But besides that, we would agree to that.

I just, based upon my history with this case and based upon the credibility of this foreign country, and the hostility and the upheaval in that country, I fundamentally believe that to detain this individual based upon what's presented before this Court today is not in accord with the Act and it's wrong.

And I would just ask the Court to release Father Maurizio with the conditions that we have requested or asked for, or whatever any other conditions the Court wants to put on. And I would ask at least to call a few witnesses on his behalf if the Court would allow me to.

THE COURT: Sure. Sure, go ahead. Why don't you have all of the proposed witnesses stand and be sworn together, and that way we can cut down on the use of time.

MR. PASSARELLO: If we could have stand -- and, Judge, although I'm not going to call all these, but just in case.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PASSARELLO: Christine Shaulis, Joshua
Shaulis, Robert Choby, RoseMarie DiLoreto, Charles
DiLoreto, Cynthia Howard, Angie Maurizio, Dr. Vince and
Joey Vena, Michael Knapp, and Dick Stern.

```
1
               (Prospective witnesses were placed under oath by
 2
       Courtroom Deputy Price.)
 3
               THE COURT: Go ahead and call your first witness.
 4
               MR. PASSARELLO: Initially we'd call Dr. Vince
 5
       Vena.
 6
               THE COURT: Now, before counsel even goes on the
 7
       record, you have a daughter named Aubrey?
 8
               THE WITNESS: I do.
 9
               THE COURT: Classmate of my son's. It's a small
10
       world.
11
               THE WITNESS: It is.
12
               THE COURT: And both of our children attended
13
       Bishop McCort together. So we already have -- I have
       never -- I didn't know your name. And then Sunday at
14
15
       church I find out that you were once stationed at my
16
       parish.
17
               So it's inevitable that there's going to be
18
       some -- you know, I've known you probably for 25 years.
               MR. PASSARELLO: Yes, you have, Your Honor.
19
20
               THE COURT: I've worked with Attorney Haines for,
21
       I don't know, however long it's been, and so.
22
               MR. PASSARELLO: Every time I see you now you
23
       tell me how much older I'm getting.
24
               THE COURT: Yeah, yeah, and vice versa. So
25
       anyhow, I've had people on my -- anyway. Okay, and the
```

```
1
       court reporter, it's the doctor who operated on her leg,
 2
       so it's a small world.
 3
               MS. PRICE: Sir, would you state your full name,
 4
       please.
 5
               THE WITNESS: Yes. Vincent E. Vena, V-E-N-A.
 6
               Your Honor, thank you for allowing me to speak
 7
       today.
 8
               MR. PASSARELLO: Well, hold on. I've got to ask
 9
       you some questions.
10
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
11
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
12
       BY MR. PASSARELLO:
13
          Dr. Vena, let me ask you, How do you know Father Joe
14
       Maurizio?
15
          I've known Father Joe for 17 years.
16
           And in what capacity do you know him?
       Q.
17
           My initial exposure to him was as a hospital
18
       chaplain at Conemaugh when I was a young physician
19
       there. We have since had many interactions. He was at
20
       one point associated with St. Stephens Parish where I
21
       was a parishioner. We have had the opportunity early in
22
       his mission work to help try to organize a medical team
23
       for Honduras. We've been very supportive of his mission
24
       work in the Honduras.
25
           I have since had the opportunity to directly
```

attend -- be with him on mission work in Costa Rica,
with my family and my boys and my daughter.

- Q. In any of your associations, especially on your mission trips with Father Joe, have you seen him do anything inappropriate, such as the allegations here today?
- A. Absolutely not. I think you have a small army of people here that will testify to the character of Father Joe as an individual who is absolutely committed to helping some of the most desperate people in the world.

  And I've had the opportunity to witness that firsthand.

Many of these kids, most in this room couldn't appreciate what they're going through. They have no families, they have no support system. Many of the communities they're in treat them as they're rats.

Father Joe is driven to help them and, you know, his many trips are involved in that.

I have had the opportunity -- my wife, Joey is here today with me. She has attended early in the mission work in the Honduras directly with him there working, had the opportunity to assist not only at the orphanage but in the prison system.

I recently -- last year, maybe two years ago, I can't recall -- was with him for a two-week trip to Costa Rica where we did mission work and actually spent

1 time, leisurely time, vacation, if you will, with Father
2 Joe, which is unusual for him.

And I will tell you, to see how these children respect is what I would describe it as, you know, because no one else is supporting them, I will tell you, in many cases.

So to answer your question, no. I have never witnessed, with my own family or with any other interaction around these children, any behavior that was unbecoming of someone who is otherwise just priestly, faithful, and committed to helping.

And I will tell you, my training allows me to see concerning behavior. I'm trained to look for it, if you will. You know, the grooming, the other activities that would take place in a predatory nature. None of that.

- Q. Do you have children?
- 17 A. I do.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 18 Q. How old?
- 19 A. I have three children. They're all teenagers now.
- Q. Girls, boys?
- A. I have an older girl, she's 18. And then I have two
- boys who are now 16 and 13.
- Q. Would you have any concerns leaving those children
- 24 with Father Maurizio?
- A. No. And I have. You know, it's -- none at all.

1 MR. PASSARELLO: Thank you. 2 THE COURT: The government gets to cross examine 3 you. 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION 5 BY MS. HAINES: 6 Sir, I believe you said that you accompanied Father 7 Maurizio to a recent mission trip in Costa Rica. Yes, ma'am. 8 Α. 9 Were you present then when there was a transmission 10 from Father Maurizio to the 16 year old where he asked 11 if the boy was asking -- or do you want me to come and 12 spend the night with you? Were you present when that 13 transmission from the father went to the 16-year-old 14 boy? 15 Α. No. 16 Would you agree with me, too, that someone who would 17 be engaging in inappropriate and criminal sexual 18 behavior with children would not do it right out in 19 front of you or your wife? You would agree with me, 20 would you not? 21 A. I would agree. 22 MS. HAINES: Okay. No further questions. 23 THE COURT: Anything else? 24 MR. PASSARELLO: No, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Doctor, you

1 may step down. 2 MR. PASSARELLO: Your Honor, I would call Joey 3 Vena. 4 MS. PRICE: Would you state your full name, 5 please. 6 THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm Dr. Johanna Vena. 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. PASSARELLO: 9 Q. And, Dr. Vena, are you familiar with Father Joseph 10 Maurizio? 11 A. Yes, I am. 12 And how are you familiar with him? 13 I have known Father Maurizio for over 15 years, as 14 he was a priest at our parish, as a personal friend, and 15 from doing mission work in Central America with him. 16 Q. Now, that was your husband that testified 17 previously? 18 A. Correct. 19 He indicated you had done -- you were actually in 20 Honduras with Father Joe? 21 A. That's correct. 22 And have you ever seen Father Joe act in any 23 inappropriate way with minor children, as alleged by the 24 United States?

A. I have seen Father Joe interact with many children

on many occasions, and never was there any concern of any inappropriate behavior. He treats every child, as well as every adult, on these mission trips with the utmost respect. And I've seen nothing but respect returned to Father Joe in appreciation from the children, the orphans, and the people who are working in the missions.

- Q. These children in the Honduras, how are they treated down there?
- A. Well, in the missions they're treated very well.

  But these are children that come off the streets and, as my husband said, there's no, no safety net for these children. And the government, before the orphanages were opened, would shoot these children who were homeless and causing problems on the street. They were very desperate.

Father Joe gave them a place of safety. He gets them healthy, he educates them, he gives them a future. And Father Joe I know would never do anything to hurt these children. He's committed his entire life to helping these children who otherwise likely would never survive and certainly have no future.

- Q. You have children, obviously?
- A. Three.

Q. Would you have any concerns leaving them with Father

1 Joe?

7

- A. I have left Father -- our children have interacted
  with Father Joe on numerous occasions. I've never had
  any concerns. One of my children is here to show the
  support and how strongly we feel that Father Joe would
- 6 never do anything to hurt our children or any others.
  - Q. Have your children ever complained he's done anything inappropriate?
- 9 A. Never.
- MR. PASSARELLO: I have nothing further.
- 11 THE COURT: Okay. The government gets to cross
  12 examine you.
- 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 14 BY MS. HAINES:
- Q. Ma'am, you would agree with me you haven't been on every single mission trip with Father Maurizio, have
- 17 you?
- 18 A. I have not.
- Q. And would you also agree with me that there have
- 20 been times on some of the trips where he was accompanied
- 21 by people that Father Joe would go down either before
- 22 the rest of the group would arrive or stay a little
- 23 longer? Is that correct?
- 24 A. I would not be aware of that.
- Q. So it didn't happen on your trips, but it may have

```
1
       happened on other trips?
 2
       A. I would not know.
 3
       Q. And would you agree with me, as I asked your
 4
       husband, that someone who would be engaging in the type
 5
       of conduct that has been alleged today probably wouldn't
 6
       do that out in front of you or your husband. Correct?
 7
       A. I agree.
 8
               MS. HAINES: Thank you.
 9
               MR. PASSARELLO: I have nothing further.
10
               THE COURT: Dr. Vena, just one question: The
11
       time frame of the trips that you made with the
12
       defendant, when was that?
13
               THE WITNESS: The Honduras trip was in the early
14
       2000s, and the Costa Rica trip was two years ago.
15
               THE COURT: Thank you.
16
               MR. PASSARELLO: Judge, I would call Angie
17
       Maurizio.
18
               MS. PRICE: Would you state your full name,
19
       please.
20
               THE WITNESS: Angela L. Maurizio.
21
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
22
       BY MR. PASSARELLO:
23
           Ms. Maurizio, real briefly, where do you reside?
       Q.
24
           809 Sugar Maple Drive, Windber. My brother's farm.
       Α.
25
       Q.
          So you live with him?
```

```
1
          In the last two weeks, yes. I've been there for a
 2
       year.
 3
          If he is released would that be where he would be
 4
       residing?
 5
          Yes.
       Α.
 6
           And you would be living with him there as well?
       Q.
 7
       Α.
          Yes.
 8
       Q.
          And if there were conditions placed upon him by this
 9
       Court would you help to assure that they're followed?
10
       A. Yes.
11
               MR. PASSARELLO: Thank you. I have nothing
12
       further from this witness, Your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Cross examine.
14
               MS. HAINES: No questions, Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: The government has no questions.
16
       Thank you.
17
               MR. PASSARELLO: Judge, most of the other
18
       witnesses would testify substantially similar to the two
19
       doctors, and so based upon our presentation today, I
20
       would ask that the Court consider release for Father
21
       Maurizio.
22
               THE COURT: All right.
23
               MS. HAINES: Your Honor, I neglected to put one
24
       factor forth when we were going back and forth.
```

United States has further information just for the Court

to consider. The agents were able -- and they actually have a copy of it -- the Honduran authorities have signed off on an arrest warrant for Father Maurizio.

And I guess, as I understand it, the steps they take in Honduras to secure his arrest is they sign the arrest warrant, which has been signed, and then they turn it over to INTERPOL as well as the Honduran police.

So we're in that intermediate step where they've let us know that they've got it signed. They just need to turn it over to INTERPOL, which will then cause a red notice to go out, which would require him to go into custody as a result of an INTERPOL arrest warrant through Honduras.

THE COURT: The United States is party to an extradition treaty with the Honduras?

MS. HAINES: I believe we are. I've talked with the CEOS, the Center for Exploited Children out of Washington, D.C. The way she explained it to me it's a very old treaty, but what would happen is if an arrest warrant was issued through INTERPOL on the father, which it appears they are taking those steps, that Father Maurizio would be taken into custody in this country and have to fight extradition back to Honduras while he remained in custody here so --

THE COURT: Right.

1 MS. HAINES: -- that's my understanding. 2 THE COURT: Yeah. I presume we just don't whisk 3 people away. 4 MS. HAINES: No. As Washington, D.C., alerted 5 us, that once that arrest warrant that has been signed 6 gets into Interpol's hands and the red notice is out, he 7 will be taken into custody but will have to be in 8 custody to fight it. 9 But for whatever that's worth, that has not 10 happened yet. Of course, we stand on the fact that we 11 in the Western District of Pennsylvania have laid 12 sufficient grounds that have not been rebutted for risk 13 and danger --14 THE COURT: When you say "that has not happened," 15 what is the "that"? 16 MS. HAINES: We have a copy of the signed arrest 17 warrant. 18 THE COURT: They just haven't entered it into 19 the system. 20 MS. HAINES: They have not entered it or turned 21 it over to INTERPOL yet, which we believe may -- it 22 could happen today or any day. They've just alerted us 23 that they've had it signed. 24 THE COURT: All right. So we could have spared 25 the lurid details that the news media's in the back

1 busily taking down if you'd just told me that release or 2 detention is a moot point. 3 MS. HAINES: It's not a moot point though, Your 4 Honor, that's the thing. It's not a moot point because 5 until the Honduran authorities turn it over to INTERPOL 6 it's just a piece of paper they have signed. They 7 simply let us know, here's a picture of it --8 THE COURT: All right. 9 MS. HAINES: -- if you guys proceed with your --10 THE COURT: I understand. 11 MS. HAINES: -- case. 12 THE COURT: Yeah. I understand that. All right. 13 MR. PASSARELLO: Your Honor, I apologize. But it 14 definitely is not a moot point. It's my understanding 15 that back in 2009 a substantially similar document was 16 signed and nothing went -- happened with that in 17 Honduras. Our legal team in Honduras is investigating 18 this document that they are referencing that, in fact, 19 we have known about. I believe it allegedly was signed 20 approximately one month ago. I don't believe it's a 21 moot point because of what happened five years ago. 22 same thing could happen substantially again. And if 23 you're going to detain him based on the fact that we 24 have mere speculation that they could be filing this 25 with INTERPOL and they take him into custody, I don't

think that's appropriate.

THE COURT: Right. On the other hand, my charge is to make sure that he is available for hearing in this case.

MR. PASSARELLO: Correct.

THE COURT: And if he is whisked away to have to fight extradition on a charge from Honduras, that's just as much of a problem from my point of view, under my duty under the statute, as if he fled to, you know, outer Mongolia. So the status of the charges in the Honduras are significant.

All right. Now, there are two competing points of view here: We have some charges from 2009 which you say are trumped up by hostile Honduran authorities, that are completely at odds with everything else that the defendant has done over the last 15 years.

The government's position is that we have some horrific circumstances, which for some reason the ball was dropped in 2009, but now are coming to light.

What's interesting to me is that in 2014, this summer, we have a border search, perfectly legal under the Fourth Amendment, seizing the cell phone. And then we have an execution of a search warrant which comes up with at least an image, maybe images, of child pornography.

And I completely don't regard the possibility that there might be thousands of other images on these multiple things that were seized, because if it isn't here in court it's not evidence. And so the possibility of something is it's a possibility, but it's not evidence.

But let me ask this, Attorney Passarello: You got a guy who knows, who believes, who's had attorneys defending himself since 2009 against these charges. And yet on his computer, which is seized in September of 2014, we have an image which, subject to defenses, is illegal child pornography.

Since it would be crazy for me to possess something like that if I knew there were false accusations out there, what possible reason would there be for him to possess something like that? And this is -- I'm thinking out loud for both of counsels' benefit.

What you're describing is Jekyll and Hyde.

Father Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. You've got wonderful

things, you've got terrible things. You've got one

person though. I can't let Dr. Jekyll go free and

detain Mr. Hyde. So, you know, do we -- don't you see

that there's some evidence here? I mean, a 69-year-old

man who's got photographs of minor boys naked sounds

more of a compulsive thing to me than anything else.

1 And if we have somebody who's under some kind of 2 compulsion, don't we have a danger to the community? 3 MR. PASSARELLO: Your Honor, if I may? 4 THE COURT: Yeah. Sure. 5 MR. PASSARELLO: First of all, I don't believe we 6 have someone who's under the compulsion --7 THE COURT: Well --8 MR. PASSARELLO: If you listen to the United 9 States' presentation the image -- of course, I have yet 10 to see it -- the image was found on a rectory computer, 11 and that they indicated here that they intended or will 12 attempt to try to show that Father Joe actually took 13 that picture. They haven't any proof of that. There's 14 no proof that Father Joe even knew it was on that 15 computer. 16 THE COURT: But there I can follow a chain of 17 inferences that if the person is at a mission where he 18 was -- unless there's some evidence that there's 19 somebody else at the rectory who would have had the same 20 access and the same -- yeah. I think that chain is 21 satisfactory. 22 MR. PASSARELLO: Or even a time and date when 23 that was taken. 24 THE COURT: Oh, sure. When we're talking proof 25 beyond a reasonable doubt this isn't even -- this

doesn't even step up to the plate.

MR. PASSARELLO: But I think if we're talking compulsion, Your Honor, you'd have way more than just one image on the computer -- I'm sorry, two, they've alleged two. It's absolutely an affirmative defense to the statute in the first place.

THE COURT: Yeah --

MR. PASSARELLO: I agree. Listen, I agree. If somebody -- if we knew these allegations were 2009, maybe you'd think that if there were any images on the computer somebody would try to wipe them clean. I just don't see the compulsive behavior that this Court is seeing based upon those images.

What I see, I see a lot of speculation here. I see a lot of guess. I see a lot of -- you say we have a Jekyll and Hyde, okay --

THE COURT: I say that's a possibility.

MR. PASSARELLO: I believe the individual that has been portrayed by us and our witnesses are based upon fact and testimony that we've presented to this Court.

The other individual that the Court sees is based upon a proffer on speculation. And the bottom line to me, Judge, is Father Joe, as I've known him, is a good man. He has done wonderful work, and I don't think

there's any debate about that.

I think that the charges that we've addressed in 2009 and the charges that we intended to address here, you have to say where the source is coming from. And I just think that the precautions and the statute that the Court has to look at and the factors, we can obviously get rid of flight risk, and I think we can protect the community, whatever concerns the Court has or the United States has, by putting those specific and strict conditions on his release.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PASSARELLO: And we let INTERPOL do what Interpol's going to do if they, in deed, are going to do anything. The Court's absolutely right, the FBI had this back five years ago. And you characterized it as dropping the ball; I characterize it as there was nothing there.

THE COURT: No. I said that's the supposition here that they're advancing, yeah.

MR. PASSARELLO: I would ask that the Court consider release.

THE COURT: All right. Why speculate when we can actually have evidence?

Attorney Haines, how long does it take the government to do a forensic analysis of the devices

seized?

MS. HAINES: I was there on -- last week I was in their office. They were working around the clock. They have gone through, like I said, there are thousands and thousands of images. There were four computers -- five computers. There was one camera that had approximately 18,000 photos on. They are flagging photos that raise the eyebrow.

And just to give you an example of how it's going, I asked them to estimate to get through all of everything you have -- they know everything they have -- how long. They said, If we worked around the clock from the day I was there, they said we'd need three more weeks. But they showed me what they were already flagging.

Obviously, just for the record and for clarity, there are -- the child pornography images, there are two. Of the one that is clear-cut, not a question in the agents' minds, I've seen them as well -- it's clear-cut child pornography. It's of the same child but two pictures; one from a distance and one right up on the child.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. HAINES: They are also flagging any and all pictures that appear to have children who are naked.

There are a few pictures they have flagged from his recent trip to Costa Rica -- excuse me, the Dominican they have flagged where he takes a picture of the whole child. And then he takes a picture just of the waist down. And they have flagged those pictures as well, where there's a sequence of pictures. So that's the process they're going through.

Then you add in the Google app translation that we've talked about --

THE COURT: Right. Okay. I don't need to rehash the evidence. What I'm asking is when do you think you might have something that's new? Because going to the website in July is, you know, first of all, that's not illegal at all. And the, you know, somebody having 18,000 photographs, if they are a camera -- you know, I'm not a camera guy, but there are people who take thousands and thousands and thousands of pictures.

So the other thing -- as you and I and Attorney Passarello and pretty much everybody, Agent Bossart over here and Marshal Frank as well, know that somebody who is into child pornography they're just leaking out at the seams. There's tons of it, there's not just one or two images.

So how long before you think you -- you say three weeks.

MS. HAINES: Well, like I said, they said three. But there are images that we are calling right now child erotica, but when they are analyzed and looked at by the experts who make those decisions, there are definitely sequences of pictures that they've set aside that are quite suspicious that may or could be argued to be child pornography because the way they're taken.

We've just pointed out the two that are clear-cut. But there's groups of other pictures that we have flagged and looked at that we could make argument for as potential child pornography because of the way they're taken, the way the focus --

THE COURT: All right. "Could make an argument of potential child pornography." Make an argument that you've got child pornography.

MS. HAINES: We did. We charged him because of the two pictures we have of the child that's posed with lascivious exhibition of his genitalia. We have charged him with that in the complaint.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. HAINES: Obviously, that we did immediately when we found them. We obviously have 30 days to indict. As we continue our investigation --

THE COURT: Right. Right. Oh, yeah. Yeah. I signed the arrest warrant based on -- yes. I know you

1 got probable cause to arrest. Yes. Yes. 2 But I'm talking about what do we have here that 3 meets the statutory standards of danger to the 4 community? 5 MS. HAINES: Your Honor, we went through that. 6 First of all, there's a presumption of detention. We 7 have his behavior back in 2009. That's why it was 8 important that we went through the facts. We have the 9 recent findings. We also have a YouTube video that 10 was -- for what it's worth -- that they found and 11 tagged. So looking at his YouTube videos, they are 12 looking --13 THE COURT: All right. All right. 14 MS. HAINES: One of them --15 THE COURT: The YouTube video, tell me about the 16 YouTube video. 17 MS. HAINES: There's a YouTube video that 18 immediately caught the agents' eyes. It's a YouTube 19 video entitled, "little white boy gets raped by black 20 man." Now, I mean, that obviously raises an eye. You 21 open the video of -- obviously by what it's called it's 22 very concerning. You open the video. It's of a white

young male -- from what you can see of the screen shot,

it appears to be an adult white male that's literally

being beat up and raped by a black male.

23

24

1 THE COURT: So it's --2 MS. HAINES: Now, those things they are just 3 going through. All these things are being, you know --4 THE COURT: All right. It's lurid, but it's not 5 child pornography is what you're saying. 6 MS. HAINES: We don't believe it is, no. 7 However, you can't just look at that in and of itself 8 and say, okay, that YouTube video. In the big, grand 9 totality of the circumstances we've got images of child 10 pornography. We've got a Google app where he's asking a 11 16-year-old child if he'll spend the night with him. 12 Like I said, we have potential victims coming forward as 13 a result of this hitting the media saying we believe 14 there are victims here locally. You have the probation 15 office who's done an investigation. They are 16 recommending detention for him as well based on flight 17 and danger. 18 THE COURT: All right. Anything else? 19 MS. HAINES: No, Your Honor. 20 MR. PASSARELLO: No, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: All right. Something that nobody has 22 talked about that arises in the pretrial services report 23 is that despite the forfeiture of the passport the 24 defendant has substantial financial resources, including 25 some things that the defendant has declined to produce

or to make any comment on or to give any additional details.

Where I have somebody who is an international traveler and is able to move in interstate commerce even, and I don't know what kind of resources he has at his disposal, that's a huge red flag for me.

So I am going to detain him for two reasons: One is, I am not satisfied that the risk of flight -- I am not concerned about danger to the community. And, frankly, the case against the defendant is a lot weaker where the government hasn't even asked for detention. We have what may be an avalanche of child porn on seized equipment. But right now we have a bunch of lurid accusations. We have one image that would qualify as child pornography, subject to any affirmative defenses.

On the other hand, the fact that I don't -- I am not charged with determining guilt or innocence. I am charged with making sure that there's no danger to the community and that the defendant actually be available for trial.

It does concern me that Honduras happens to be heating up. Whether that's politically motivated I have no idea. Whether that's based on a fresh look at the evidence I have no idea. I do know that if that goes through I lose jurisdiction over the defendant, and

that's a problem for me. More problematic from my point of view is that without understanding of what resources are available to the defendant should he choose to flee, I am unable to really make an accurate judgment as to what is the risk of flight. And this is a presumption case, so where I have a doubt or a lack of knowledge, my default position is to detain, and that's what I have to do.

MR. PASSARELLO: I can provide information on his investments.

THE COURT: Well, that's what I'm coming to.

What I want from this, I want the government to give me, as soon as possible, what they've got that justifies their claim that this guy has child pornography. Because right now we don't have evidence. If they rebut the risk of flight issue, I don't think you've got danger to the community. You have a statutory presumption, which is rebutted by the proposed terms of release which would include, Attorney Passarello, encumbrance on any assets.

If this guy has a farm that can be turned into cash I want a property bond. I know I'm going to hear about it from the clerk's office because property bonds are a pain in the rear to do. But I want any possibility that this individual has resources that

would make him a risk of flight, I want that cancelled out. So I would need full disclosure from you about financial resources and encumbrances on them.

From the government's point of view, if you're seriously maintaining that this guy is such a danger to the community that there are no conditions that could assure the safety of the public, notwithstanding the fact that these allegations have been out there for five years, because those allegations from John Does 1, 2, and 3 that you're relying on, not the child pornography that's more recent -- if you're telling me he's a danger to the community I want to see some proof, some evidence, that there is something on his computer that indicates what I've termed as a compulsion.

MS. HAINES: Your Honor, are you asking that you would like the agents to bring into your private office, obviously, and click through everything they've tagged to show you, including the images of the --

THE COURT: No. I'm not going to do their job for them. Once they've sorted through tell them to bring me what they think -- I've done that before in camera --

MS. HAINES: We can bring you right now all that we have already, just scratching the surface. We'll provide all of it to you in your office if you want

```
1
       tomorrow. We'll click through them all and show them to
 2
       you what we've already flagged.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's not spend my day
       looking at 18,000 images. Pick out --
 4
 5
               MS. HAINES: Oh, no, just the ones that are
 6
       relevant --
 7
               THE COURT: Yeah. Give me your ten worst case
 8
       scenarios and I'll look at them. If you've got them now
 9
       we can step out into the hall and we'll look at them
10
       now.
11
               MS. HAINES: They're back in, HSI Pittsburgh has
12
       them in their forensic lab.
13
               THE COURT: Can they --
               MS. HAINES: We can't transmit them.
14
15
               THE COURT: No, obviously, you do not want to
16
       transmit child pornography over --
17
               MS. HAINES: No. They would have to be
18
       downloaded onto a disc and then hand carried to your
19
       office, which I can absolutely have the agents do and we
20
       can provide that to you and sit there and look at them.
21
               THE COURT: Let's do that. Now, in the meantime,
22
       for reasons that I've already stated, on the risk of
23
       flight ground only I'm going to order detention.
24
               MR. PASSARELLO: Your Honor, if I may. Would you
25
       like me to direct the investment information directly to
```

your chambers?

THE COURT: Yes. Yeah, if you want to -- if you can get that to me within the same time frame as the government is getting their evidence to me that would be appreciated.

MR. PASSARELLO: I will try to get that to you either today or first thing tomorrow. With the understanding, Your Honor, that obviously, the retaining of investigators and the defense team in Honduras costs money.

THE COURT: Is an encumbrance itself, yes.

MR. PASSARELLO: We would need -- can't deny him the right to counsel or the right to present a defense, so we just would ask the Court to take that into consideration.

THE COURT: Right. Well, you know, one of the things that certainly should be apparent to everybody is that we have minor children of desperate economic circumstances, probably not literate in English, in Honduras, some of whom are deceased. Charges which -- not those charges, but other charges, which would put this defendant in jail for the rest of his natural life. This is going to be a long, drawn-out process. Pretrial proceedings alone, given the requirement of translation, investigation, confrontation, are going to be

1 protracted. 2 I am very aware -- you know, I am very aware --3 probably less so than the prosecutor and the agents of 4 HSI, because you guys have to deal with it on a much 5 more frequent basis than I -- I'm very aware of the 6 nature of the charges and the importance of the charges. 7 But at the same time, the practical reality of 8 the government's request for detention on the basis of 9 the claim that there are no conditions that can assure 10 the safety of the public, would result in the 11 incarceration of somebody for a period of years as we 12 run up to the trial process on, at this point, nothing 13 more than what are accusations. So I hope everybody is 14 quite aware of what's at stake here beyond just the dry 15 words of the statute. 16 The defendant stands committed. 17 We are in recess. 18 (Proceedings concluded at 11:24 a.m.)

19 \* \*

20

21

22

23

24

## CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER I, Kimberly K. Spangler, Federal Official Court Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter, and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Dated this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_ 2014 KIMBERLY K. SPANGLER, RPR FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER